LOGICAL FALLACIES USE CASE

Fallacy of the Excluded Middle (AT: K Alternatives)

* Attacks **K Alternatives**
  + Cannot assume that there is only one extreme alternative that solves a problem. There are always multiple solutions. Everything is not just A or B, good or bad. My opponent is excluding a middle solution and thus committing the fallacy of the excluded middle.
  + PERM: Do a middle position while doing the Aff/Neg
* Beesely[[1]](#footnote-1),

**Fallacy of the Excluded Middle is a** common **logical fallacy**. Rare **in serious analysis**, **it** often **appears** as a rhetorical device that encourages audiences to reject complexity in complex situations, **excluding consideration of range of mid-range choices to** instead **consider only extreme positions**. The point of the gambit is to eliminate all but two choices, one of which the speaker assumes most of the audience will prefer.

* This is a misapplication of the law of logic called the law of the excluded middle

Burden of Proof Fallacy (AT: True until proven false)

* Against “True until proven false” arguments
  + Pecorino[[2]](#footnote-2),

**The burden of proof is always on the person making an assertion or proposition**.  **Shifting the burden of proof**, a special case of argumentum ad ignorantium, **is the fallacy of putting the burden of proof on the person who denies or questions the assertion being made**.  **The source** of the fallacy **is the assumption that something is true unless proven otherwise.** **The person making a negative claim cannot logically prove nonexistence.** And here's why: **to know that a X does not exist would require** a perfect knowledge of all things **(omniscience)**. **To attain this knowledge would require** simultaneous access to all parts of the world and beyond **(omnipresence).** Therefore, **to be certain of  the claim** that X does not exist **one would have to possess abilities that are non-existent.** Obviously, **mankind's limited nature precludes these special abilities.** The claim that X does not exist is therefore unjustifiable. As logician Mortimer Adler has pointed out, **the attempt to prove a universal negative is a self- defeating proposition.** These claims are "worldwide existential negatives." They are only a small class of all possible negatives. They cannot be established by direct observation because no single human observer can cover the whole earth at one time in order to declare by personal authority that any “X” doesn't exist.

Poisoning the Wells Fallacy (AT: Author Creds bad)

* Used when people attack author credentials/quality of author
  + Cannot reject an argument based on some fact about the person presenting the argument, and use that against the argument. Just because the sources are bad does not mean that the argument is not true or should be discarded.

Fallacy of the General Rule (AT: Rule usually true so always true)

* Cannot assume that just because something is true generally is true in every possible case. All rules can be broken and have exceptions. For example laws (Constitution) have exceptions. No rule can be a blanket rule. Also Morality just because it is a ‘rule’ in general does not make it true in all cases. (ADD ON: You have the universal right to question rules you do not believe to be true)

Psychogenetic Fallacy (AT: Personal belief/connection to argument is bad)

* Used if you are running a Race K(Black Body, Indian Body, etc)
  + Illogical to assume that if an argument comes from a mind that is biased for or against the idea, that the argument is false.

Heap Fallacy \*find use-case\*

* Just because there is no way two extremes meet doesn’t mean that the two extremes are the same thing. (Ex. Just because adding a stone to a small pile keeps it small doesn’t mean that the pile will never become big)

Fallacy of Begging the Question (AT: Circular Logic)

* The thing that the opponent is trying to prove is used to prove it. (Life is good because it allows us to give value to other things proving that life is good.)

Fallacy of Stolen Concept (Usually AT: Existence doesn’t exist)

* It is fallacious to use what you are trying to disprove to disprove it. (Ex: Saying that people do not exist while you are using your existence to make the argument)

Fallacy of Appeal to Authority (AT: Author Creds good = prefer)

* (1) Implies that expertise is good [it is not always good in every case]
* (2)There are degrees of expertise all of which are claimed w/o a reasonable warrant
* (3)Do not need to trust author simply on basis of credentials(Author could have majored in iridology and make arguments about philosophy; it doesn’t matter)

Fallacy of Bad Analogy (AT: Simile/Metaphor comparisons)

* Comparing something to something else and then making a conclusion based on that is fallacious. (Ex. A mind is broad like a river. The broader a river, the shallower the river. Thus, the broader the mind, the shallower the mind)

Causal Reductionism Fallacy (AT: Event has only one cause [usually extinction])

* Cannot use one cause to explain something when it could have had multiple causes. For example, genocide could be caused by resource extraction but also from other factors such as corrupt governments and madness. You cant say the only cause is resource extraction and if we fix it then the problem stops. [Use example relative to case]

Cliche Thinking Fallacy (AT: Quotes at top of case[Medina])

* Cannot use a well-known statement as evidence to prove a claim.

Fallacy of Composition (AT: Generalization) \*must expand on this\*

* Cannot assume that a broad theory/topic has the same simplicity as its individual parts.

Fallacy of Division \*must expand\*

* Cannot assume that what is true of the whole theory is same as the individual parts of the theory

Slippery Slope Fallacy (AT: DA Extinction, Multiple Links, etc)

* Cant assume that something is wrong because a possible result of it is wrong.
* My opponent has many links leading to extinction on his Disad. However, he commits the Slippery Slope Fallacy, because the aff advocacy is not wrong because it could possibly lead, through multiple links, into something bad.

Appeal to Coincidence Fallacy (AT: Argument is just coincidence so don’t believe it)

* It is fallacious to assume that something that happened is simply due to chance and will not happen again.

Argument by Generalization Fallacy (AT: Empirical Evidence)

* You cannot draw a broad conclusion from some specific evidence. It is fallacious to assume that just because it is true in these places means that it is true in all cases.

Argument by Fast Talking (AT: Spreading) \*DON’T SPREAD \*

* Going from one idea to the next too quickly does not allow the opponent to think enough to process the argument.

Least Probable Hypothesis Fallacy (AT: Extreme Impacts)

* My opponent is ignoring all of the possible explanations and creating an argument based on the least possible implication. (RULE: Occams Razor explains that the simplest impact is the best)[terminology to use to sound smart, “most parsimoniuous”]

Argument By Scenario Fallacy (AT: Narratives) \*Not Complete\*



Argument from Inertia Fallacy (AT: Deontology Act-Omission Distinction)

* Saying it is necessary to continue on a course of action even after it is determined that it is mistaken because changing course would admit to oneself that they made that descision is fallacious. You cannot not take an action because you don’t want to admit it to yourself.

Fallacy of Complex Questions (AT: CX questions)

* As response to question that demands a yes/no question without allowing you to challenge the basis of the question. (Do we look to statistical evidence under a Deant FW? Yes or No?). Just say, “you commit the fallacy of complex questions. Allow me to question assumptions first.”

Fallacy of Essentializing (AT: Saying Squo is how things will always be)

* It is an empty claim to say that things are made a way in nature and thus this is the way it will always be and thus there is no use changing it. This is a logical fallacy.

Paralysis of Analysis Fallacy (AT: Cant predict consequences)

* Opponent says that since all data can never be found, any action should be delayed or not be committed(until forced by circumstances). This commits the paralysis of analysis fallacy

Snow Job Fallacy (AT: Overwhelming Amount of Empirical Evidence)

* My opponent commits this fallacy by overwhelming the judge and me with many pieces of evidence just to overwhelm the judge to vote for his side. This is a fallacy that corrupts logos.

Politician’s Fallacy (AT: Any Action > Inaction)

* My opponent creates the Politician’s Fallacy by assuming that just because something has to be done to solve a problem, any viable solution can be implemented. They are thinking along these lines: Something must be done, [insert their argument here] is something, and thus [argument] must be done. This is the Politician’s Fallacy, which is corrupted from pathos.

Fallacy of False Compromise (AT: Perms)

* By trying to perm my advocacy, my opponent is committing the fallacy of false compromise. He is trying to find a middle ground between the two advocacies where he can advocate for both. This commits this fallacy because one side could be arguably wrong meaning that the compromise is false and thus fallacious.

Fallacy of the Crucial Experiment (AT: Scientific Warrant)

* My opponent commits the fallacy of Crucial Experiment by trying to claim that my argument is untrue/(his/her) argument is true because of some discovery made. This is fallacious because experiments about how things happen can never by conclusive based on scientific evidence because it is always changing. This is a distortion of the true scientific principles.
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